

REMARKS

Applicants traverse and respectfully request reconsideration of the application.

Claims 1-74 were pending in the Application. Claims 3, 15, 19, 35, 49 and 63 were cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 22-24, 33, 34, 36, 44, 47, 48, 50, 58, 61, 62, 64, and 72 were amended. Claims 75 and 76 were added.

The claim amendments and the addition of claims 75 and 76 find support in the claims themselves. With regard to the replacement of the expression “a rib” with “an extension” relative to the first part, the amendment finds support on page 2, line 15, page 16, line 2, and page 17, line 6.

A fee amounting to \$200.00 for the addition of independent claims 75 and 76 is submitted herewith.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. The remarks of the Examiner regarding claim for domestic priority are acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The remarks of the Examiner regarding the Information Disclosure Statement are acknowledged.

Double Patenting

3. The remarks of the Examiner regarding Double Patenting are acknowledged, and a Terminal Disclaimer is submitted herewith.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 22-24, 44, 58 and 72 were objected to because of a number of informalities. These claims were properly amended to overcome said informalities, and applicants earnestly believe that the informalities have been removed, and therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of the objections.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

5. Claims 1, 14, 18, 22, 26, 33, 41-45, 47, 55-59, 61, and 69-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vassiliou (U.S. 6,691,380 B2).

Applicants amended claims 1, 14, 33, 41, and 61 in a manner to include the limitations of claims 3, 35, 49, and 63, respectively, which were allowable subject matter (see Allowable Subject Matter). Claims 3, 35, 49 and 63 have been cancelled since their limitations have been transferred to claims 1, 14, 33, and 61, respectively.

Since the rest of the claims depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 14, 33, 41, and 61, which also have become allowable, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all claims that have not been cancelled with regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vassiliou (U.S. 6,691,380 B2).

With regards to new claims 75 and 76, these claims recite, among other things, “the hindrance portion comprising one structure selected from ripple, side rib, upward solid bent extension parallel to the peak and the free end, knurled region.” In making the rejection of claim 1, the Office Action indirectly asserted that Vassiliou teaches bent teeth. Since claims 75 and 76 do not recite bent teeth, the Office Action has not shown that claims 75 and 76 would be anticipated. Allowance of claims 75 and 76 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

7. The comments of the Examiner are acknowledged.
8. Claims 2, 25, 30, 31, 34, 48, and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vassiliou (U.S. 6,691,380 B2).

Applicants respectfully traverse the position of the Office Action.

Since claims 2, 25, 30, 31, 34, 48, and 62 depend directly or indirectly from allowable claims, these claims are earnestly believed to be also allowable, and Applicants respectfully request removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vassiliou (U.S. 6,691,380 B2).

Allowable subject matter

The comments of the Examiner regarding the allowability of claims 3-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23, 24, 27-29, 35-40, 46, 49-54, 60, 63-68 and 74 are acknowledged.

As aforementioned, Applicants amended claims 1, 14, 33, 41, and 61 in a manner to include the limitations of claims 3, 35, 49, and 63, respectively, which were allowable subject matter, and cancelled claims 3, 35, 49, and 63, which is equivalent but less complicated than rewriting claims 3-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23, 24, 27-29, 35-40, 46, 49-54, 60, 63-68 and 74 in a manner to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. A terminal Disclaimer has also been submitted

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the above claims.

Conclusion

The comments of the Examiner are acknowledged.